


1
2 PARNELL COLVIN
3 6681 TARA AVE
4 LAS VEGAS, NV 89146
5 TELL: (503) 490-6564
6 EMAIL: PC681@YAHOO.COM
7
8



9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
11

12 PARNELL COLVIN.

Case: 2:22-cv-00082-CDS-DJA

13 Plaintiff,

14 V.

15 TAKO LLC,

16 Defendant,
17 _____ /
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

MOTION FOR THE FOLLOWING

(1). REQUESTING THIS COURT TO
RECUSAL FOR BIAS AGAINST
PLAINTIFF.

(2). REQUESTING EXTENTION TO FILE
ANSWER.

(3). REQUESTING LEAVE TO AMEND
COMPLAINT.

25 Comes now Plaintiff Parnell Colvin, and is requesting this court to grant the (3) requests he will argue in
26 this motion. Plaintiff Colvin case was originally assigned to the Honorable Richard F. Boulware, then was
27 reassigned to this court to create a case load for the Honorable Cristina D. Silva.
28

1 Plaintiff Colvin is requesting that Judge (Silva) recuse herself from the plaintiffs case plaintiff strongly believes
2 the court is bias towards him and his arguements and it seems to demonstrated an willingness to make sure
3 the defendants succeed in there efforts to have this court dismiss his claim against the defendants.
4

5 Plaintiff filed this claim against the defendants on January 18, 2022 in the federal court and supplied a copy
6 to the defendants and the court date set for January 20, 2022 was removed from calender because the Las Vegas
7 Justice Court, determined that since the federal case filed had a case number and judge assigned to case that it
8 would not hear the defendants case. The Las Vegas Justice Court on may occansions stated federal court is the
9 court to address there issues the defendants have done nothing but keep trying to pressure the Las Vegas
10 Justice Court to hear there case and it has continually rejected the defendants pressure attempts. The defendants
11 would wait for awhile then file the same case and the results were the same being they were advised to address
12 any and all concerns with the federal court not the Justice Court.
13

14 It was at this point that plaintiff Colvin, filed for a TPO / Restraining Order which this court denied but went
15 a step further in denying plaintiff motion it addressed subject matter jurisdiction and made the arguements on
16 behalf of the defendants which to this point have done nothing to address this case. Even though the court gave
17 plaintiff until October 12,2022 file an answer defendants seen this has the court signaling that the court would
18 dismiss plaintiff lawsuit. The court should have let the defendants make there arguments the court should not
19 be making arguments on behalf of either party. The defendants must have felt really good about seeing the
20 court arguing on behalf of the defendants and the defendant has to do nothing. In fact they must have felt really good
21 because soon as the court signaled it is more than likely will dismiss plaintiff lawsuit the defendants took this
22 court order and attached to another motion in the Las Vegas Justice Court again to pressure the court to hear the
23 there and again there attempts have been rejected.
24

25 Plaintiff is not going to get fairness from this court it seems the court has a personal bias against the plaintiff
26 and personal interest in the outcome of this case. The court is to be a neutral indivdual not play a role in the
27 outcome of any case but it happens all the time in the judicial system.
28

1 Plaintiff also states that the court denied his request for request for an extention of time to file his answer to the
2 court oder of October 12,2022. this court ruled because the defendant motion was dismissed that plaintiff
3 request is moot. This is not the basis for plaintiff request plaintiff needs the time to prepare for multiple cases
4 including this case. Hoever the court chose not to address plaintiff main reason for the request. The defendant
5 attorney made alot of false baseless and meritless claims in his motions and plaintiff wanted the opportunity to
6 disprove and discredit them they are not legal claims but wanted to address them since he was attacking my
7 character.

8
9 (2). Plaintiff is entitled to his first request for an extention of time to file his answer by October 27,2022.
10 Attorneys and pro se litigants always get an extention granted for cause shown which plaintiff has showed
11 this request is granted for reason one is sick, multiple cases, need time to research a case etc. Plaintiff also has a
12 case pending with the National Labor Relation Board see exhibit (1) the email stated is mine and the court can
13 see it was emailed to me on September 23,2022. Plaintiff is again requesting that he be allowed to file his
14 answer on October 27,2022 for good cause shown with preparing for multiple cases. Plaintiff believes this court
15 has been bias against him.

16
17 (3). Plaintiff is requesting the legal right to leave to amend his complaint this is plaintiff constitutional right
18 to amend his complaint. Plaintiff realizes he may lose the intial fight at the district level but there is three level
19 of the federal court system and even if this court dismiss his lawsuit he has the right and will appeal to the
20 Ninth Circuit Court Of Appeals for abuse of discretion in all the proceedings surrounding this case. Judges of
21 state and federal do misinterpreted, misread , and missapply the law all the time thats why we have higher
22 courts to review all the way to the United States Supreme Court.

1 Plaintiff believes he has showed good cause for the following requests to be granted.
2

3 (1). The judge should recuse herself from plaintiff case as it appears the court has a bias and personal interests
4 in the outcome of plaintiffs case and has been defending the case on behalf of the defendants while they sit back
5 and wait for the court to dismiss plaintiff lawsuit which plaintiff will appeal to the court of appeals.
6

7 (2). Grant plaintiff the time to file his answer by October 27,2022
8

9 (3). Grant permission to leave to amend plaintiffs complaint.
10

11 Please see exhibit # 2
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Dated and submitted this day September 27,2022
21

22 

23 PARNELL COLVIN
24
25
26
27
28

E-Service of RD Order to Reschedule Hearing in Case 28-CB-239339

EXHIBIT * 1

From: e-Service@service.nlr.gov (e-service@service.nlr.gov)

To: pc681@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, September 23, 2022 at 12:37 PM PDT

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

DELIVERY OF RD ORDER TO RESCHEDULE HEARING

Case Name: Laborers International Union of North America, Local 872, AFL-CIO (Various Employers, including the
Case Number: 28-CB-239339

In accordance with the National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations, as amended, you are hereby served with RD Order to Reschedule Hearing in this matter. You can view the letter by clicking the attached pdf file. You may wish to print or save the letter and this email for your records. You will not receive a copy of this document by U.S. mail.

Please do not reply to this email. If you have questions regarding this correspondence, please refer to the contact information contained in the attached pdf file.

RD Order to Reschedule Hearing

**DO NOT REPLY TO THIS MESSAGE. THIS IS A POST-ONLY NOTIFICATION.
MESSAGES SENT DIRECTLY TO THE EMAIL ADDRESS LISTED ABOVE WILL NOT BE READ.**

HOME ABOUT US ▾ LAW ARTICLES ▾ CASE COMMENTS POLICY ARTICLES OPIN




LAW CIRCA

Redefining Law and Policy

EXHIBIT #2

Saturday, September 24, 2022 [✉ Connect@lawcirca.com](mailto:Connect@lawcirca.com)



LAW ARTICLES CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Recusal of Judges: Everything you need to know about

📅 21st November 2020 💬 No Comments 💎 judges judiciary removal

Share this



The judicial conduct of a judge is based on this basic principle which guides him/her to serve their duty to bring justice which is to perform the duties of his office **"without fear or favour, affection or ill-will and that they will uphold the Constitution and the laws."** Article 14 and Article 21 of the constitution confers the responsibility to act fairly and impartially.